

**REMARKS**

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 1, 2008.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 are pending in this application, with claim 1 being in independent form. By the present Amendment, claim 1 has been amended and claim 3 has been canceled. It is submitted that no new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised by the present Amendment.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious from U.S. Patent 7,050,977 to Bennett in view of U.S. Patent 7,120,582 to Young et al. Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submit independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 relates to a method for natural voice recognition based on a generative transformation/phrase structure grammar. The method comprises analyzing a spoken phrase for triphones contained therein, forming words, contained in the spoken phrase, from the recognized triphones with the aid of dictionaries and syntactically reconstructing the spoken phrase from the recognized words using a grammar. The method is characterized in that the syntactic reconstruction of the spoken phrase comprises allocating the recognized words to part-of-speech categories, including verbs, nouns, etc., allocating the part-of-speech categories to nominal phrases and verbal phrases, combining the nominal phrases and verbal phrases according to syntactic rules into an object having a sequence of part-of-speech categories and comparing the sequence of the object having the sequence of part-of-speech categories with a plurality of sequences of part-of-speech categories of predetermined sentence models, and, in the case of an agreement, a sentence is considered as recognized and an action in a voice controlled application is triggered.

Bennett, as understood by Applicants, relates to a speech-enabled server for internet website and method. A two step algorithm is provided for processing of the speech input signal. The first step is a “high-speed first-cut pruning mechanism.” The text string undergoes morphological linguistic processing, the string is tokenized, the tags are tagged and the tagged tokens are grouped. The noun phrases (NP) of the string are stored and copied and transferred for use by DB Engine 186 during a DB Process at step 1110. The string corresponding to the user’s query which was sent to the DB Engine 186 is used together with the NP to construct an SQL Query which is executed to retrieve a record set of potential questions corresponding to the user’s query. The second step then processes the record set of potential questions.

The Office Action cites Col. 17, lines 53-67 and Col. 34, lines 34-51 of Bennett as allegedly disclosing allocating the recognized words to part-of-speech categories, including verbs, nouns, etc. As understood by Applicants, this portion of Bennett describes tokenization in which segmentation extracts the tokens and keeps track of where they originated from in the input text and categories are associated with each token based on its shape. Following tokenization, a stemmer process is executed for analyzing the tokens to determine their respective stems. However, as described at Col. 34, lines 47-50 of Bennett, while the stemmer associates an input word with its stem, “it does not have parts of speech information.”

In contrast, as now recited in independent claim 1, the method is characterized in that the syntactic reconstruction of the spoken phrase comprises allocating the recognized words to part-of-speech categories, including verbs, nouns, etc., allocating the part-of-speech categories to nominal phrases and verbal phrases, combining the nominal phrases and verbal phrases according to syntactic rules into an object having a sequence of part-of-speech categories and

*comparing the sequence of the object having the sequence of part-of-speech categories with a plurality of sequences of part-of-speech categories of predetermined sentence models*, and, in the case of an agreement, a sentence is considered as recognized and an action in a voice controlled application is triggered.

Applicants find no teaching or suggestion in Bennett of comparing sequences still less *comparing the sequence of the object having the sequence of part-of-speech categories with a plurality of sequences of part-of-speech categories of predetermined sentence models*, as now recited.

Young et al. was cited as disclosing triphones and their use in speech recognition. However, Young et al. provides none of the elements missing from Bennett that would have made the claims obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, Applicant submits independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Entry of this amendment and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI  
Reg. No. 33,515  
Attorney for Applicant  
Cooper & Dunham LLP  
Tel.: (212) 278-0400